

Chapter Five

Italian Unification

Outline and Study Guide:

1. Various Interpretations
2. Factors unfavorable and favorable to Italian unification
3. *Risorgimento* from 1815-1848
4. *Risorgimento* from 1848-1870
5. What were the main schools of ideas on Italian unification? Examine their respective success and failure.
6. “The failure of 1830 and 1848 revolutions contributed considerably to the eventual success of Italy’s unification.” Critically examine the validity of this statement.
7. Explain the initial success and ultimate failure of the revolts which broke out in 1848 Italy.
8. Give an account of the obstacles to Italian unification and explain how these unfavorable elements were removed in the course of Italian unification movement.
9. Evaluate the contributions of Cavour, Mazzini and Garibaldi to Italian unification.
10. Discuss the positive and negative role of Cavour in the Italian unification movement.
11. Compare the role of Cavour and Napoleon III in the Italian unification movement.
12. “Italy could not make herself; she could only be made by exploiting the differences between the great powers” How far is this true of the Italian liberation by 1861?.
13. “Italy could not stand it alone.” Critically examine this statement with reference to the Italian unification movement from 1830 to 1870.
14. “Nationalism and liberalism went hand in hand.” Discuss the validity of this statement with reference to the Italian unification movement in the 19th century.
15. “Nationalism was the main shaping force in Italian unification movement.” Discuss the validity of this statement.
16. “Liberalism was the main shaping force in Italian unification movement.” Discuss the validity of this statement.
17. “Italy was unified by improvisation instead of calculation” Discuss this statement.
18. Compare and contrast the Italian and German unification in terms of leadership, obstacles and reasons of success.

Various Interpretations

M. Salvadori

1. "The Franco-Piedmontese Alliance proved that Cavour only wanted to unify northern Italy but not the whole Italy."

A.J. Taylor

1. "Cavour put himself first."
2. "Garibaldi put Italy first."

Metternich

1. "In Italy, provinces are against provinces, towns against towns, families against families, and men against men." (Italy before the 1850s)

George Meredith,

1. "Cavour, Mazzini, Garibaldi: Three: Her brain, Her Soul, Her Sword".

Mazzini

1. "the baton of Metternich governs and directs all the petty tyrants of Italy."

Cavour

1. "The talk of Italian unity was a lot of nonsense."

Lipson

1. "He (Cavour) was undoubtedly the main architect of Italian unity."
2. "Whatever the original inspiration of Italian unity, whatever the agencies which helped to achieve it, there can be no doubt that its real architect was Cavour."
3. "The unification of Italy did not follow any pre-conceived plan, and many ideological, political and economic forces aided it, directly and indirectly. Curiously, a favorable European climate was an essential ingredient for the unification of Italy. There existed several pairs of the international conflicts, and out of their inter-action sprang the Italian unification."

R.R. Palmer

1. "Italy was made....by the long high-minded apostate of Mazzini. The audacity of Garibaldi, the cold policy of Cavour, by war and insurrection, by armed violence endorsed by popular vote."

V.D. Mahajan

1. "Unification of Italy was completed in 1870 as a result of the efforts of the Italian patriots, foreign help and the force of circumstances."

Factors unfavorable and favorable to Italian unification

I. Factors unfavorable to Italian unification

1. The Vienna Settlement

- i. The prosperous regions of Lombardy and Venetia became a province in the dynastic collection of the Austrian House of Hapsburg.
- ii. King Victor Emmanuel I of the House of Savoy was restored to the Hybrid Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia.
- iii. Petty sovereigns dependent on Austria were restored to the duchies of Modena, Parma, Lucca and Tuscany.
- iv. The Papacy recovered the Papal states.
- v. The Bourbon King was restored to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

1. Metternich influence from 1815 to 1848

- i. Metternich dominated affairs in Italy. Through the Congress System he was able to exert influence to check the process tenting towards unification. The Troppau Protocol was declared, justifying the policy to interfere and suppress revolution in any European country. Thus the revolution in Naples, 1820 failed when the Laibach Congress authorized an Austrian army to be sent to restore King Ferdinand to absolute rule. On its return, the same army put down another revolution in Sardinia. More than that the Congress of Verona decided to stamp out the revolution in Spain with a French army. A revolution likely to excite the Italians was suppressed through Metternich's insistence. This prevented any chance of Italian unification.
- ii. Revolutions of 1830 in the Duchies and the Papal States were crushed by the Austrian arms. The result of these revolutions of 1820 and 1830 was to give Austria paramount control over the peninsula. The day of unification was farther away.
- iii. Strict measures followed revolutions. For example, Mazzini was persecuted for being a thinker and was imprisoned.
- iv. Generally speaking, the failure of revolutions in 1820 and 1830 showed the difficulties confronting the makers of unification were:
 - the need of a capable leadership;
 - the need of foreign help to overcome Austria;
 - the need of wielding popular enthusiasm for the cause instead of rising on local scales or half-hearted cooperation.
 - the need of overcoming divided aims when some favored a republic and others wanted a constitutional monarchy while yet another group supported a confederation under the Pope.

II. Factors favorable to Italian unification

1. Legacy of French Revolution

During the French Revolution of 1789 and under Napoleon, Italy came under French dominion. Nationalism was born during this period. Italy was less divided than it had been for centuries; there was an approach to unity and this led some

Italians to desire the end of their long standing divisions. This feeling was accompanied by a hatred of foreign domination.

2. **Indirect encouragement of nationalism and liberalism by the Congress of Vienna**

Though the diplomats at Vienna did divide Italy, they did not succeed in quenching the national spirit Napoleon had roused. During the years after the Congress the desire for some kind of unity grew stronger, particularly in the south. This desire vented itself in sporadic insurrections which were promptly suppressed by Austrian soldiers. After every such uprising the Austrian government ruthlessly crushed all outward symptoms of opposition of independence. However the severity of these measures only gave substance to the spirit of nationalism. On the surface the Austrians continued to exercise their dominion, while underground systematic preparations were being made for the *Risorgimento*- the movement for liberalism, reform and unification of Italy.

3. **Secret Societies and the spreading of nationalism and liberalism**

An important factor in the agitation was the secret societies, the largest of which was the Carbonari, or Charcoal Burners. It had been estimated that by the year 1820 the membership in these societies numbered well over 100,000, drawn from all social classes. Under the watchwords 'freedom and independence' the Carbonari were ceaselessly active in exciting opposition and revolution against foreign rule. This was distinctly nationalistic. But the revolutions of 1820 and 1830 which they actively promoted, were unsuccessful. Their failures discredited it.

4. **Outstanding leadership: Mazzini, Gioberti, Cavour and Garibaldi**

Another important factor in bringing about the *Risorgimento* was the impassioned leadership of idealists and intellectuals. They kept the hopes for an independent and united Italy alive even when their fortunes were at lowest ebb. The historical writing of Balbo, the poetry of Leopardi, the novel of Mazzini, the musical composition of Verdi all inspired the Italian mind to conceive of an unified Italy under Italian rule.

I. Giuseppe Mazzini

The greatest of these idealists and the inspirers of most of the rest, was Giuseppe Mazzini. He was one of the three men to whom above all others the attainment of Italian unity was due. George Meredith, the English poet, said, "Cavour, Mazzini, Garibaldi: Three: Her brain, Her Soul, Her Sword". He created the spirit of the *Risorgimento* and made the Italian realize that, since they were one people, they should be unified. In other words, he was the apostle of Italian unity and nationhood.

- i. Born in Genoa and the son of a university professor, he studied law and read widely in the writings of democratic thinkers. His radical learning soon aroused the suspicion of the authorities. He had joined the revolutionary society of Carbonari and then exiled for participating in one of its riots. Having lost faith in Carbonarism, whose leaders were largely men of advanced years, he decided to entrust the cause of Italy to youthful minds and hands. Accordingly he organized among the Italian exiles in Marseilles a society called Young Italy (1832). It spread rapidly through all northern and central Italy, attracting mostly students, young professional men, and youths of the mercantile classes. Within two years the membership grew to more than fifty thousand. The banner of the organization bore on one side the words, 'Unity and Independence' and on the reverse 'Liberty, Equality Humanity'. Members

undertook to disseminate the national idea regardless of sacrifices and hardships even at the risk of their own lives. Soon the leaven of freedom and unity had permeated every part of Italy. Uprisings were organized in Italy. He thus provided not only ideas but also actions. All these favored growth of a nationalist glow throughout Italy: the *Risorgimento*.

- ii. Besides founding and directing the activities of Young Italy, Mazzini also exercised great influence through his writings. He wrote many fervent articles and pamphlets which, though immediately banned by the government, were smuggled into Italy. They were widely read, particularly by the educated classes. Mazzini regarded the political division of Italy and of other parts of Europe as artificial. He believed that before all else the states of Europe must be remodeled to conform as far as possible to the principle of nationality. But he did not regard the nation as an end in itself. Each nation had 'its special mission to execute' and only as a nation can a people contribute its due share to the general welfare of mankind. As to his country Italy, he thought that it should become a Republic. This was because Mazzini regarded a republic as the only form of government consistent with the dignity of a people. He was the leading figure in the establishment of the short-lived Roman Republic during the revolution of 1848-49. The most celebrated disciple of Mazzini was Joseph Garibaldi, who was attracted to 'Young Italy' its nationalism and republicanism.

II. Vincent Gioberti

- i. A second group, seeking to reconcile traditional religion with modern liberalism, was led by Vincent Gioberti, a Piedmontese priest, who lived many years in exile but he was never a republican. His chief book, the *Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians* (1843), urged a confederation of existing Italian states, each provided with a liberal constitution, and all presided by the Pope. A considerable number of upper class persons, including patriotic members of the Catholic clergy, shared his dream, and for a brief time Pope Pius IX had appeared to sympathize with it. Pius IX strengthened the hopes of his followers by granting a list of liberal concessions unprecedented in modern Italy.
- ii. Starting with an amnesty for political prisoners, he served as the prime minister of Sardinia. He issued edicts removing some of the restrictions from the conferring municipal government on Rome, and summoning an advisory council composed almost exclusively of laymen. He further increased his stature as a national hero by his hostility to Austria and by signing with Piedmont and Tuscany a custom treaty which could have been the beginning of deferral union of all Italian states. However when he saw that the people would be satisfied with nothing less than a constitutional government, he began to retreat. Further reforms, he believed, would be incompatible with Papal sovereignty. During the revolution of 1848, which saw the establishment of a short-lived republic in Rome and the flight of the Pope to Gaeta, Pius repented of his liberalism and became a confirmed reactionary.

III. Camillo Count di Cavour (1810-61)

- i. Born in 1810 and belonging to a noble Piedmontese family, he was to acquire fame as the foremost liberal nation-builder of the 19th century. He followed

the usual career of one in his position and became an officer in the army. But his liberal sympathies caused a quarrel with the authorities over his support of the 1830 revolution in France. He left the army in 1831. He devoted himself to the improvement of the family farms and to foreign travel. He had traveled widely in England, France and Switzerland and was a keen student of advanced western methods in agriculture, industry and parliamentary government. It became the mission of his life to 'westernize' Piedmont and eventually the whole of Italy. In 1847 he established a journal *Il Risorgimento*, advocating Italian unity and liberty. His articles in this journal exercised great influence on the king as well as on public opinion.

- ii. In 1848 he took a seat in the parliament which had been established as a result of the 1848 revolution; In 1850 he was appointed minister of agriculture and commerce; and 1852 as Prime Minister and also the virtual ruler of the kingdom. 'To convert Sardinia into a united Italy' was his goal. He wanted to unify Italy under his master and make an Italian nation which was a constitutional monarchy.
- iii. His methods
 - He realized what a strong Sardinia was essential for achieving Italian national unity. Reforms were therefore undertaken, affecting the army, communication, industries, trade, public works and customs. (see next parts) He believed the necessity of foreign help to expel Austria and he looked to British sympathy and French military help. He would not miss any single chance to bring the Italian grievance to their notice and secure their sympathy and help.

IV Giuseppe Garibaldi

- i. Garibaldi, a native of Nice in Savoy, was a soldier-adventurer who carried out irregular warfare to unify Italy. A republican and free thinker, he became an early member of Mazzini's Young Italy. Condemned to death for his part in a revolt in Savoy in 1834, he managed to escape to South America where he plunged at once into the revolutionary wars. There he gained the expert knowledge of guerrilla warfare which served him so well in the conquest of Naples and Sicily. He returned to Italy in 1848 and fought under king Charles Albert in the war against Austria, carried on guerrilla warfare in the foothills of the Alps. With Mazzini, he helped to establish the Roman republic in 1849 but failed to defend it against French troops; went into exile to America. Returned to Italy again in 1859 during the Austro-Sardinian War, Cavour raised an irregular force of mountain troops for Garibaldi which conducted guerrilla warfare against the Austrians. He hated Cavour for giving Nice, his birthplace, to France by the Treaty of Turin of 1860. He always disliked Italy's becoming a kingdom instead of a republic.
- ii. It was by the work of Garibaldi that Naples, Venetia and Papal States joined Piedmont.

Risorgimento From 1815-1848

I Revolts from 1820 to 1830

1. Under the government established in 1815, national patriotism was unlawful. Most of the Italians were indifferent to revolution, and even actively supported the anti-revolutionary forces. Only the liberals advocated freedom, constitutional government and national sovereignty.
2. Carbonari, the secret society which advocated popular sovereignty, certain mixed and vague political ideals and the overthrow of existing government, was one example.
3. Under influence of such secret societies, in 1820 and 1821 there were military coups with liberal aims in Naples and Piedmont. Nonetheless, they were suppressed by Austrian forces under the influence of Metternich.
4. In 1830, liberals were encouraged by the July Revolution. The leaders were those intellectuals. The movement was weakened by provincial rivalry and personal jealousies. Some liberals and nationalists imagined that Louis Philippe might come to their support, but Louis Philippe had no desire to challenge Austria.
5. Enrico Misely, a lawyer of Modena, had planned a scheme for the creation of constitutional kingdom of Central Italy under the Duke Francis of Modena. Misely believed that Louis Philippe would give him a new hope that France would oppose any Austrian intervention in Italy. He desired that a united Italy would be created in the midst of conflict between France and Austria. In February 1831 a revolt broke out in Modena. Francis betrayed the movement and arrested those local leaders. There were disturbances in Bologna and Parma. It was the lack of agreement between the rebels and the indifference of the masses that made the revolt failed.

II. 1848 Revolution

1. Before 1848 most of the Italian states were subjected to Austrian rule, except the Papal states and the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia. Most of Italians were influenced by secret societies such as Carbonari and Young Italy which spread the revolutionary ideas throughout the Italian states.
2. In January, 1848, a rebellion against the misrule of Ferdinand II broke out. As a result, he was compelled to grant a constitution to Sicily. In February and March, the Naples, Tuscany and Piedmont as well as the Pope were induced to grant constitutions. On 18 March, revolts broke out in Milan (in Genoa) forced the Austrian troops to evacuate. Revolts broke out also in Venice and the republicans set up the Republic of St. Mark and forced the withdrawal of Austrian forces. As a result, revolts broke out in Lombardy, Venetia, Parma, Tuscany and Modena.
3. On 24 March, Piedmont, under Charles Albert, together with Lombardy declared war on Austria. The Pope however did not want to engage war with Austria which was a Catholic country. The other states also followed the Pope and gave only little support to Charles Albert. Thus Piedmont and Lombardy eventually defeated on 24 July. Charles Albert abdicated in favor of his more stable son, Victor Emmanuel II. In the meantime, unrest in Rome led to the flight of the Pope and the establishment of the Roman Republic. In this stage, Mazzini's long cherished ideal of a republic was set up. With Garibaldi's support.

4. In July 1849, France overthrew the Roman Republic and French troops occupied Rome, the unrest in Rome was ended with the restoration of Pius IX under the protection of French troops. On 28 August, Republic in Venice was also suppressed and the Revolution failed.

III. Result of 1848 revolution

1. For the four constitutions granted in 1848, only Sardinia Constitutionalism perpetuated. Piedmont became the most liberal state and the paradise for the political exiles of other states.
2. In 1848 Cavour favored the formation of a unitary state in northern Italy. After the defeat, Cavour realized unification could not be achieved without economic and military strength or foreign help. Therefore, in the 1850s, he carried out a series of reforms, took part in the Crimean War, and concluded a treaty with France.
3. Before 1848, Gioberti, Mazzini and Federalists balanced each other. After the failure of the Revolution, the influence of Gioberti declined rapidly. The illiberal Pope was no longer regarded as suitable leader for a unified Italy. Mazzinianism never recovered in the 1850s to attract younger generations.

Risorgimento From 1848-1870

New Situation

1. In the 1850's the Italian unification movement was more united than before. Most of the liberals looked to Piedmont, with foreign help, to steer towards unification;
2. By the beginning of 1856 most Italian patriots were convinced that Cavour stood firmly for free institutions and for a unitary state;
3. In the 1850s reaction dominated the Italian states except Piedmont, which resulted in the high prestige of Piedmont in the eyes of patriots.

Cavour's domestic measures

Despite his limited sympathy towards Cavour, King Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont appointed Cavour the Prime Minister in 1852. Cavour then carried out a series of reforms

Cavour aimed to make Piedmont economically progressive, politically liberal and financially stable. In this way he hoped that Piedmont would be strong enough to assume the leadership of Italy in the event of another war with Austria.

Examples of areas in which Cavour's measures were effective were the following:

1. Military aspects.
His first reform concerned military affairs. He saw that if Piedmont were to unite Italy, it must prepare for a new war; hence, he reorganized the army, built new fortresses or strengthened old ones, and generally increased the military resources.
2. Economic and Communicative aspects
 - i. He also gave much attention to the development of industry and commerce. The building of factories and the importation of machinery were encouraged.
 - ii. The public budget was reorganized, and the taxes, though increased, were more equitably distributed.
 - iii. He was also able to obtain a large loan from a London bank. He put accounting in order and introduced new fiscal policies.
 - iv. Communications were improved by the building of railways, roads, harbors, a tunnels through the Alps, and a line of steamboats between Genoa and America. Piedmont came to be linked more closely to the West.
 - v. Furthermore, Cavour negotiated commercial treaties with France, England, Belgium and Holland, Switzerland. In short, he launched Piedmont on a career of rapid commercial progress. The wisdom of his economic administration was rewarded by the loyalty with which the nation supported all his foreign undertakings.
3. Political aspect
He reinforced the constitution in two ways:
 - i. to reduce the elements of feudal and clerical privilege;
 - ii. To build a board reliable majority which would consolidate the parliamentary system and the positions of those who prepared to work through it.
4. Religion
 - i. In 1850 he drafted the Siccardi Laws which curbed the powers of the Church by abolishing ecclesiastical courts.
 - ii. In 1855 religious orders were abolished, except those concerned with teaching, preaching and helping the sick.

Therefore, by 1859, Piedmont was the most powerful state in Italy.

Cavour's skillful diplomacy:

I. French aid sought

The Italian failures of 1848-9 convinced Cavour that Italy could not achieve unity without foreign help. Britain was sympathetic to the Italian cause, but was not likely to render material assistance. Her diplomats believed that Austrian power in central Europe was necessary to preserve the balance of power between France and Russia. Cavour wanted to prevent any chance of Austria consolidating her power in Italian affairs. Napoleon III, the champion of nationality, seemed a likely ally to help Piedmont overturn the status quo.

Reasons for Napoleon's interest: For different reasons Napoleon was interested in the affairs of northern, central and southern Italy.

1. Northern Italy. Napoleon's family origins had been Italian and he was a former member of the Carbonari. He wanted to help Piedmont free Italy from Austrian rule, but his motives were far from altruistic. French nationalists did not want a strong power rising on their south-east border. Napoleon hoped that French influence would replace that of Austria in northern Italy and also that France's Alpine frontier might be restored by the acquisition of Nice and Savoy.
2. Central and southern Italy, Napoleon had no wish to unite Italy as many liberals hoped. He wanted to keep Italy weak and divided, and except as far as the north was concerned, was a supporter of the status quo.
3. Napoleon relied on the support of the clerical at home. He therefore supported the Pope's position in central Italy even though this presented an obstacle to Italian unity after 1848.
4. King Ferdinand of the Two Sicilies was supported by the Tzar, with whom Napoleon wanted to remain on good terms. Napoleon therefore opposed any action likely to harm the position of the Bourbon monarch.

II. Piedmont in the Crimean War.

Cavour hoped European powers might be interested in Italian problems if Piedmont played an active role abroad. In December 1855 France and Britain invited Piedmont to join them in the Crimean War. The Piedmontese cabinet opposed the idea, but Cavour eventually brought Piedmont into the war.

In 1856 a Piedmontese force under La Marmora did well at the battle of the Tchernaya. This helped to extinguish the stigma of earlier defeats at the hands of Austria, and Piedmont staked a claim to Italian leadership.

At the Paris Peace conference Italian affairs were debated and Napoleon continued to express interests. However, Cavour was unable to gain French support for any changes in Italy.

III. French aid and the Austrian war of 1859

A. The Orsini Incident. Cavour despaired of help from France. Napoleon appeared to have forgotten about the Italian cause. However, it was soon brought to his attention in a forcible manner. In January 1858 Felice Orsini, an Italian patriot, tried to assassinate the Emperor in front of the Paris Opera House. Orsini, together with his accomplices, was arrested. He later appealed to the emperor to assist Italian liberty, charging him with being a traitor to the cause of Italian freedom. This appeal was read out at his trial. Napoleon was sufficiently impressed to have it published and sent a copy to Cavour.

France protested strongly to Britain, where the bombs used had been manufactured, and to Piedmont. Victor Emmanuel gave a firm reply, while Cavour took measures against the Mazzini press. This mollified the anger of Napoleon, who then decided to assist Cavour in earnest.

B. Franco-Italian negotiations. The following steps were taken to form closer liaison between Piedmont and France.

Plombières meeting. Napoleon invited Cavour to a meeting on 20th July 1858. He suggested that a northern Italian state under Emmanuel and a central Italian federation under the presidency of the Pope should be formed. Cavour was cautious and nothing definite was signed. The meeting was novel in that it was a deliberate attempt to manufacture a war. Napoleon agreed to help Piedmont if she were involved in war with Austria. Nice and Savoy were to be ceded to France in return for her assistance.

Marriage arrangement It had been agreed at Plombières that a marriage would first be arranged between the daughter of Emmanuel, the 15-year-old Princess Clotilde, and Jerome, a cousin of Napoleon III. This took place in September 1858 and cleared the way for tightening the arrangements between the two countries.

Military alliance France and Piedmont signed a formal military alliance in January 1859. This time no mention was made of a federation or of any specific state boundaries. Napoleon hoped these would be based on his Plombières proposals. The details were as follows:

1. France would defend Piedmont from attack if Cavour was able to engineer hostilities so that Austria appeared the aggressor.
2. France would supply 200,000 troops and Piedmont 100,000.
3. a northern kingdom would be created, and Papal sovereignty maintained. Piedmont would gain Lombardy and Venetia in the event of the Austrian defeat.

C. Formation of the National Society

In 1857 Mazzini, working from England, organized insurrections in Genoa and Livorno. They failed and a similar fate befell a landing at Sapri on the Calabrian coast. Many Italian nationalists then realized the futility of isolated uprisings. A new organization, the National Society, was formed which united many of the groups of the early *risorgimento*. Its leaders were Pallavicino, La Farina, Garibaldi and Daniele Manin. They believed that Cavour would be a valuable ally to coordinate the activities of the Italian national movement. The motto of the society became "Independence, unity and constitutional liberty under the Savoy dynasty."

D. Austria provoked by Cavour

In 1857 the Liberal Archduke Maximilian had been made viceroy in Lombardy and had tried to enforce a conciliatory Austrian policy. However relations with Pied-

mont had been poor. In February Cavour had broken off diplomatic relations with Vienna over the expulsion of a Sardinian senator from Lombardy.

After the Plombieres meeting in mid 1858 Cavour planned to bring about war with Austria. He tried to avoid placing Piedmont and France too clearly in the wrong. Austria disliked the following however.

Piedmont's refusal to extradite draft evader. At the end of 1858 Austria imposed military conscription in Lombardy and Venetia. To evade the draft, many fled to Piedmont, and when Austria demanded their return this was refused.

E. Cavour's negotiation with the National Society.

Cavour saw the value of encouraging the conspiratorial activities of the secret societies, which many Italian supported. These societies advertised the problems of Italy abroad and contributed to the raising of the political temperature at home.

Publicly Cavour disowned any activities which would be viewed with alarm in London and Paris. Privately he opened negotiations with the National Society. He informed La Farina in October 1858 of his aims to bring about uprisings in the northern and central states. The Society played a valuable part in preparing the public mood for war. Garibaldi was asked to form a volunteer force, and many of the recruits for this were Lombard. The Society prepared arms depots and circulated pamphlets supporting Piedmontese leadership.

F. Ultimatum from Austria

1. Both Austria and Piedmont started to mobilize their forces. Cavour aimed at a defensive mobilization to force Austria to issue an ultimatum. In February 1859 Britain sent a mission to Vienna to urge demobilization. However, in March a secret Franco-Russian Treaty provided for Russian neutrality in the event of a Franco-Austrian war and for Russian troop movements to threaten Austria in the east, on condition that France supported Russia's policy of revising the Black Sea clauses.
2. Gorchakov, the Russian Foreign Minister, proposed a congress to solve the question. This was accepted by Britain and Napoleon, but Austria demanded Piedmont's exclusion from the congress and demanded the disarmament of Piedmont before the congress met. Napoleon, pressured by the other European states, and disheartened by the lack of enthusiasm at home, forced Cavour to agree to the Austrian demand on 19th April.
3. Because of the wish to protect her security, Austria had made the initial mistake of mobilizing her large army too soon. To keep the Austrian army mobilized indefinitely was an expensive procedure if peace negotiations were prolonged. Buol, the Austrian Chief Minister, was impatient of delay. He ignored the warning of his more cautious colleagues to avoid precipitate action until the French position had been clarified. This was sound advice, for there was the possibility that the Franco-Piedmontese alliance would collapse, given time for diplomatic pressure to be exerted on the wavering Napoleon.
4. Piedmont was on the point of disarming when Buol, on 19th April, sent a fatal ultimatum giving Cavour 'within three days' or war. This was a blunder as it supplied Cavour with the provocation he needed. Piedmont refused, and Austria declared war, thereby appearing the aggressor.

G. Defeat of Austria

The military weakness of Austria was soon revealed. Important factors contributing to her defeat were as follows.

1. Poor commanders. The Emperor Francis Joseph took personal charge of the army. He relied for advice on Count Grunne, who had no combat experience. The incompetent Gyulai was appointed to the Italian command. Inadequate use was made of the abilities of Benedek or the strategist Hess.
2. Poor strategy. Austria delayed invading Piedmont in force until 29th April. This gave Napoleon time to move troops into Italy, making maximum use of the recently completed railway system. The Austrians were confident of victory, and neglected to organize an adequate supply system (there was no railway between Trieste and Venice) and to acquire accurate knowledge of enemy strength and capabilities.
3. Insufficient forces. Austria was not able to utilize all her available forces. It was necessary to retain German and Czech troops in Hungary to prevent a possible rising there. Troops were also kept in reserve in case France attacked through South Germany. Austria thus sent only 90,000 men to Italy.
4. Poor morale. The loyalty of the army to the Austrian cause was slender. The different national elements of the army had no interests in the issue of the campaign. Italians, Hungarians and even the trusted Croats deserted in large numbers.

Gyulai's lack of decisiveness allowed the French and Italian forces to combine. After preliminary skirmishes, two bloody battles were fought at Magenta and Solferino. Losses were heavy on both sides but they were narrow victories for the French and Italians, who then conquered the whole of Lombardy. The Austrians retreated into the Quadrilateral.

IV. The Peace at Villafranca.

Preliminary peace terms were settled by Napoleon and Francis Joseph on 11th July at Villafranca near Verona. Cavour was not consulted.

Peace conditions were as follows:

1. Lombardy, except for the fortresses of Mantua and Peschiera, was to be transferred to Piedmont. Napoleon was to be the intermediary in this arrangement. Parma was tacitly conceded as well.
2. All Italy was to be included in a new confederation, This was to be under the titular presidency of the Pope.
3. The hereditary rulers of Tuscany and Modena were to be restored.
4. Austria was to retain Venetia. This state was to form part of the new confederation.

A. Short-term result; Provision listed as 3 and 4 above seemed to negate the purposes of the war, for the following reasons:

1. Austria was still in a dominant position in Italy. She was still militarily strong, controlling the Quadrilateral without having to defend the awkward Plain of Lombardy;
2. France had achieved nothing. She had incurred considerable military expense and her troops had suffered heavy losses, but she received no thanks for her help and made no territorial gains. The war had provoked much hostile criticism at home, and Piedmont considered Napoleon a traitor to the Italian cause for abruptly terminating hostilities;
3. Piedmont had gained only Lombardy. Cavour resigned in disgust.

B. Failure of the settlement. Event in Italy took a surprising turn which was to help the Italian cause. The Villafranca terms were unenforceable for the following reason.

1. The duchies refused to accept the return of their rulers. After successful revolutions the duchies were not prepared to accept the restoration of their rulers. The royal commissioners refused to stand down. They were helped by the National Society. Modena, Parma and Romagna were united under the name of Emilia, by La Farina. The government was then organized to petition for annexation by Piedmont.
2. Tuscany wanted to unite with Piedmont, but initially distrusted her. However, Baron Ricasoli triumphed in persuading the Assembly to vote for union. The Pope refused to cooperate. He was not keen to see the formation of any confederation, fearing the loss of his power. A pamphlet had been issued in France with the approval of Napoleon which suggested that the Papal territories should be reduced to a minimum.
3. Napoleon refused to allow force to be used to implement Villafranca. In August the representatives of France, Austria and Piedmont met in Zurich. Napoleon opposed the idea of an enlarged Piedmontese union. He also rejected the use of force. This meant that Austria was unable to restore the rulers in the duchies, since this would have been impossible without the use of force.
4. Britain gave moral support to Italy. In the 1859 election a strong Liberal government came to power in Britain under the leadership of Palmerston and Russell, who favored the creation of a unitary Italian state. In January 1860 they urged France and Austria to abstain from intervention in Italian affairs.
5. Russell suggested to Napoleon four points which would allow the duchies to vote on the question of annexation to Piedmont through elected assemblies.

C. Agreement between Cavour and Napoleon

Piedmont was as powerless as Austria to act without the consent of the powers. However, events were by then favorable to the Italian cause and Cavour returned to the office in January 1860. He resolved to break the deadlock and bluntly asked Napoleon for his price for annexation. Napoleon III was only prepared for Piedmont to annex Tuscany and Emilia if France was compensated for the creation of a powerful state on her south-eastern flank. Cavour agreed to cede Savoy and Nice.

It was agreed in the Treaty of Turin of 24th March that plebiscites would be held in all the areas concerned. Austria was prepared to acquiesce in these arrangements, and Cavour was ready to abandon his belief in elected assemblies in favor of this rather false method of testing popular approval. The plebiscites were carried out in the presence of French and Piedmontese troops. They resulted in an overwhelming majority in favor of annexation by Piedmont of the central Italian states, and for annexation by France of Nice and Savoy.

Unification of Southern Italy with the North

A. The Conquest of Sicily

1. The success of national movements in central Italy encouraged similar movements in the south. The Sicilians were conspiring to overthrow their weak and oppressive

king, Francis II. The rebels asked Garibaldi to help. The revolt in Sicily seemed to him the golden opportunity to carry out the Italian movement forward on his own initiative. He disliked Cavour's policy, especially the alliance with Napoleon III and the handing over of his native city of Nice to the Emperor. Also he had been encouraged by Mazzini to take action with the aid of the Sicilian movement.

2. In April 1860 the Sicilians revolted. The rapidity of events forced Cavour to take advantage of movements already beyond his control. He had no particular sympathy for the south and distrusted Garibaldi. However, he knew that Mazzini's agents were active in the south and that unless he tried to mold events to his advantage republican and separatist ideas might succeed there. He managed to divert the energies of Garibaldi to Sicily without officially encouraging him.
3. Garibaldi gathered a thousand picked volunteers at Genoa. Cavour refused to give public support, wanting to avoid a clash with Austria, and Garibaldi was prevented from getting recruits from the Piedmontese army or rifle supplies. British war-ships protected the Thousand when they arrived at Marsala in Sicily. Austria and France might have intervened were it not for the knowledge that Palmerston and Lord Russell then in power in England- were in sympathy with Garibaldi.
4. There were 24,000 troops in Sicily but Garibaldi had the support of the entire population. Within two months Garibaldi had conquered Sicily and proclaimed himself the dictator of the island.
5. The people of Naples on the mainland were highly excited and prepared to welcome him. Victor Emmanuel and Cavour were however alarmed, for to continue the revolution in Naples thence to Rome would endanger the whole cause of Italian unity. An attack on Rome by Garibaldi's Red Shirts would provoke Austrian and French hostility and intervention. The king then forbade Garibaldi to cross the Straits of Messina from Sicily into Naples, though he was not really offended when Garibaldi disobeyed him and invaded Naples.

B. The Conquest of Naples

In August 1860, Garibaldi, with a much enlarged army, crossed to the mainland. Everywhere the people welcomed the invaders. By September they had entered Naples. King Francis II having fled northwards from the city. Garibaldi's progress became a triumphal procession. He was then joined by Mazzini in Naples. It was Garibaldi's intention to march on to Rome and turn over the whole of southern Italy to King Victor Emmanuel II.

C. Cavour's intervention and Victor Emmanuel's invasion of the Papal States and Naples

1. The dramatic victories of Garibaldi did not all suit Cavour's plans. To attack Rome would mean trouble with France and with the whole of Catholic Europe. To force the pace of events too hard might also call down a further onslaught from Austria; and since the republican supporters of Mazzini were gaining great strength among Garibaldi's followers, there was every danger that the nationalist movement might abandon Piedmontese leadership and turn republican. He had to therefore somehow check Garibaldi's plans.
2. He turned again to his old ally Napoleon III, who for different reasons shared Cavour's fears. By agreement with France, Cavour sent the Piedmontese army to invade the Marches, which had been prepared by the work of his agents to receive it. The army then destroyed the Papal forces led by General Lamoriciere, a French

Catholic royalist; and it marched on to Naples, forestalling and checking the movement of Garibaldi. A plebiscite was held in Umbria and the Marches in October, and they were duly annexed to the Piedmontese monarchy in November. In the same month Emmanuel and Cavour rode into Naples, similarly annexed after a popular plebiscite.

3. Emmanuel and Garibaldi met in Naples. Realizing that he could never complete the conquests of the other fortresses alone, Garibaldi surrendered his power and his army to Emmanuel. He refused all honors and rewards and retired to the simple life of a farmer. His intervention had been decisive, though it had served Cavour's cause more than his own.

D. Creation of the Kingdom of Italy 1861 and death of Cavour

In January 1861, the first all Italian parliament met in Turin, and Victor Emmanuel II assumed the title of King of Italy. Only Venetia and the city of Rome remained unconquered for Italian unification. On 6th June Cavour died, dying at the very moment when his arrival seemed essential if his work were to be completed and true national unity preserved.

E. The union of Venetia

Only Venetia and Rome remained outside the united Italy. The acquisition of Venetia was achieved through the help of Prussia. In the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, Italy joined Prussia against Austria on the Prussian promise that she would get Venetia if they won the war. This would mean Austria would have enemies on both sides. The Italians were beaten. Prussia was victorious. By the Treaty of Prague, Italy received Venetia in return for her help.

F. The union of Rome

1. For Rome also the Italians had to thank Bismarck. The maintenance of a French garrison in Rome for the protection of the Pope was one of the devices by which Napoleon III sought to satisfy the Catholics and a rash attempt made by Garibaldi to capture the city in 1867 was easily defeated by the French troops.
2. However in 1870 when the Franco-Prussian War broke out, the French troops in Rome were recalled to help fight the Prussians. In September 1870, the Italian troops occupied Rome. A plebiscite was held which resulted in a vote in favor of union with Italy. Rome became the capital of Italy. The acquisition of the Eternal City as the center of the new kingdom marks the completion of the building of modern Italy. The Pope was confined to the Vatican City.

What were the main schools of ideas on Italian unification? Examine their respective success and failure.

In 1820 and again in 1830, Italy was affected by revolts in various states. Isolated and sporadic, these were easily suppressed when the rulers received assistance from Austria. Meanwhile, a new generation of Italian leaders emerged. They were able to draw lessons from the failures of the uprisings and realized that the secret societies movement, without leadership, organization and clear-cut objectives, was unlikely to deliver Italy. In the course of time, three main schools of thought on how to achieve Italian unification emerged.

Mazzini and the republican idea: The first school of thought was the republican idea of Mazzini (1805-72). Though a member of the Carbonari in the 1820s, he realized that secret society was doomed. In 1831, he founded the Society of Young Italy at Marseilles, advocating the creation of a single united republic at Italy. To achieve this, the Austrians had to be driven away by the combined efforts of all Italians. With the expulsion of the Austrians, despotic rulers in Italy could be overthrown easily.

As its title implied, Mazzini's Society directly appealed to the Italian youth. He urged his followers to go beyond the middle class to the common people. The movement soon registered a nation-wide membership with local committee in the main Italian cities.

Gioberti and the federalist idea: A second school of thought was the federalist idea of Gioberti who was a liberal-minded priest advocating a series of bold reforms in his "The Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians." He suggested that the Papacy should lead in the reform movement and preside over an Italian federation of princely states.

His program had a wide appeal for sometime because many Italians saw it as a means to reconcile nationalism with religious faith. It attracted greater support when the 'Liberal Pope' Pius IX was elected in 1846.

D'Azeglio and the monarchist idea: a third school of thought was the monarchist idea of D'Azeglio. He believed that Italy could be united under the House of Savoy in Piedmont-Sardinia. Only that country had sufficient resources to fight and expel Austrian influence in Italy. This line of thought was supported by many in Piedmont. Under the reign of Charles Albert, a series of reforms were carried out and Piedmont became the most politically active region in Italy.

Naturally, the choice among these three schools of thought was decided by the course of events.

Having failed to persuade King Charles Albert to his cause, Mazzini attempted an invasion of Piedmont in 1833. After its failure, Mazzini lived in exile in Britain. He was again active in the Italian revolutions of 1848-9. He played a role in the short-lived 'Roman Republic' episode. Together with the failure of the Republic of St. Mark at Venice, it appeared that Mazzini's idea of a united democratic Italian republic was hard to materialize. Besides, his ideas were becoming unattractive in the face of Cavour's success on unification in the late 1850s. After another Mazzini-inspired revolt had failed in 1857, many of his followers deserted him. In 1872, Mazzini slipped back to Italy to die at Pisa in his homeland.

The federalist idea was equally unsuccessful. At first, the reforms of the 'Liberal Pope', Pius IX, did lend force to the idea and many saw him as a possible leader of Italy. In the end, the Pope could not stand the test of circumstances. In 1848, the Pope initially supported the war of independence led by Piedmont against Austria. He soon changed his mind, ordering the withdrawal of Papal forces from fighting Austria, a major Catholic country. His action demoralized the Italians, and he lost the chance to become an Italian leader. When unrest spread in Rome, leading to the proclamation of the Roman Republic (1849), Pius IX fled to Gaeta in Naples where he sought foreign assistance to restore his position. Finally, he returned to Rome in 1850 under the protection of a French expeditionary force. He had then lost all interests in unification and liberalism.

The monarchist idea proved to be the solution for Italian unification. Of course, the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia alone could not fight against Austria, as seen from her defeats in the battles with Austria in 1848-9. King Charles Albert, much depressed, abdicated in favor of his son, King Emmanuel II.

The whole episode, however taught the Italians nationalists good lessons. They realized that in the next forward movement, Piedmont was destined to lead. That country had bravely fought Austria, though defeated. She also refused to abolish the liberal constitution of 1848, despite Austrian pressure. Under the guidance of the new king and the reform policy of Cavour, Piedmont was increasingly strengthened. All these in effect reinforced the monarchist idea of D'Azeglio.

Secondly, the Italians realized that they could not possibly shake off Austrian control without help from other powers. In this respect, Cavour was to play an important role. Apart from strengthening Piedmont, Cavour was able to make use of international events to further Italian unification under the lead of Piedmont-Sardinia. In the end, the united Italy was ruled by a constitutional monarchy under the House of Savoy.

“The failure of 1830 and 1848 revolutions contributed considerably to the eventual success of Italy’s unification.” Discuss.

Although the results of the 1830 and 1848 revolutions were disastrous, the uprisings were not without value and did contribute considerably to the eventual success of the Italian unification in 1870. In this respect, the above statement is valid and I would like to discuss it in the follows:

In 1830, revolts organized mainly by the Carbonari broke out in Modena, Parma and the Papal States against the Austrian regime. The success of these uprisings depended on French assistance which did not come. Austria was given a free hand and her intervention proved fatal once more to all prospects of success as the revolts were swiftly crushed.

The failure of 1831 rebellion caused the collapse of the old secret societies as a political force. The Carbonari, the federation of their cognate societies now sank into insignificance. Besides, the revolution gave birth to the ‘Young Italy’ founded by Mazzini who realized that the former Carbonari were too weak to carry out the revolution. The teaching of Mazzini- liberty, independence and unity of Italy exerted great influence on the Italians. All over Italy were groups of men who absorbed his teaching and accepted his ideal. His propaganda through the ‘Young Italy’ broadened the political horizon of the Italian and created a vigorous opinion in favor of national independence.

Furthermore, the failure focused Italian attention upon the real problem which confronted them- the need for the expulsion of the foreigner- Austria. This imprinted upon the heart of every Italian the supreme lesson that all efforts were unavailing, unless directed first and foremost towards the overthrow of Austrian domination.

Thus, the failure of the 1830 revolutions contributed considerably to the eventual success of Italy’s unification by giving birth to the movement for national regeneration and giving the Italians the lesson that Austria must be expelled before they could become independence.

Upon 1848, opinions upon the unification of Italy were divided: a united Italy under a reformed Papacy; a democratic republic advocated by Mazzini; as well as monarchical rule under Piedmont. This division directly retarded the united efforts of the people to claim their independence. By the failure of 1848 revolution, the Papacy and democratic republican were proved impracticable. After 1848 all Italy looked to Piedmont as their leader of national regeneration. In this way, the failure of 1848 revolutions unified the people to follow the same way to obtain their goal.

Gioberti’s suggestion of a federated Italy under a reformed Papacy seemed to become reality in 1846 by the ascendancy of a new pope- Pope Pius IX who was believed to be anti-Austrian and a liberal. He proclaimed amnesty for all political offenders, granted limited freedom to speech and press and other liberal measures. When Piedmont fought against Austrian intervention in March 1847, papal troops were dispatched presumably to cooperate with Piedmontese army. However, in April 1847 the Pope announced that he opposed offensive war against Austria and withdrew his troops. This indirectly caused the defeat of Piedmont in the course of 1848 revolutions, revealing that Pope Pius IX was far from being a real liberal and even further from being a genuine nationalist. Gioberti’s dream had collapsed.

Mazzini's advocacy of a united Italy based on democratic republic also could not stand in the testing ground of 1848. A provisional government was established in Rome during the Pope's flight to Naples in February 1849. Rome was proclaimed a republic. Mazzini became the head of the government and carried out a series of reforms. However, this republic was crushed speedily by the armed intervention of Spain, Austria, Naples and France. The failure of the Rome Republic showed that enthusiasm, intelligence and visions had proved no substitute for guns and the people revived faith in Sardinian constitutional monarchy as the only generally acceptable solution.

After 1848, Piedmont became the only hope of Italian unification. This hope was fulfilled in 1870.

Although defeated under Austrian army at Novera in March 1849, Piedmont's desperate effort to defend Italy gained prestige among the Italians. The failure of the 1848 revolutions made Piedmont overrun the other two schools of thoughts and so unified the Italians efforts to their goal.

Before 1848, Italy's unification was based upon liberal idealism and popular enthusiasm. By the failure of 1848 revolutions their ideals crashed. The people became more practical to prefer unity first. Besides, Piedmont was convinced that their defeat by Austria was mainly due to their economic and military weaknesses. They saw the need of improving the state in case of war against Austria. Thus, the failure of 1848 revolutions contributed considerably to the eventual Italian unification as it drove Piedmont to be economically progressive, politically liberal and financially stable so as to be capable to the final struggle against Austria.

The failure of 1848 revolutions also convinced the Italians deeper that Italy alone could never expel their dreadful enemy-Austria. Foreign aid was needed to do the job. This realization proved right by 1870. It led Piedmont to obtain the French aid in fighting the war against Austria in 1859 and thus took the first step of the eventual unification of Italy. Moreover, it was foreign help that eventually made Italy.

The failure of 1830 and 1848 revolutions contributed considerably to the eventual success by giving Italians bitter lessons. The Italians thus learnt what they lacked and what they should obtain in order to fulfill their dream. The failures of these two revolutions made the Italians realize Austria was their dreadful enemy and must be removed in the course of unification and independence. Furthermore, the latter revolution gave rise to Piedmont as the national leader of the Italian struggle. Thus, by the disillusion and realization the Italians obtained in 1830 and 1848, they were more ready to proceed to their final destination.

Explain the initial success and ultimate failure of the Revolts which broke out in 1848 Italy.

After 1815, the Italian states were divided into 8 parts, as Metternich described, it was “just a geographical expression”, rather than a nation-state. Five parts were under Austrian rule, one under Bourbon, and only Papal states and Piedmont-Sardinia were under Italian rule. However, as liberalism and nationalism were prevailing throughout Europe at that time, the Italians revolted against the foreign rule and wanted to establish a ‘nation’. Even in 1830 there were revolutions in Northern Italy. In 1848, the national movements were more bigger and wider. Although the revolutionaries could get some states from the hands of foreigners, they failed ultimately due to some reasons. There are several reasons for the initial success and ultimate failure of the 1848 revolutions in Italy.

Firstly, Pius IX, elected the Pope in 1846, began with a series of reforms subjecting the clergy to taxation, summoning a council of state which included several laymen and freeing political criminals from imprisonment. Thus the liberal hopes for unification under constitutional government was raised to a height hitherto never reached. The Pope’s popularity carried off all those who desired unification, inducing them to discard for the moment their disagreements as to the form of a government of united Italy.

Moreover, in the 1830s, Mazzini’s Young Italy helped spread the revolutionary ideas and sense of unity to Italian states. It aroused great nationalist passion throughout the peninsula. So ideologically Italy was well prepared for a revolution.

Besides, the modernization of the Sardinian Kingdom since Charles Albert’s accession to the throne in 1831, despite his despotic rule, was in tune with liberal aspiration. From 1847 onwards, the king professed himself to be anti-Austrian. His decision taken in February 1848 to abandon absolutism and to lead the Italians raised the hope of an early defeat of Austria. It also encouraged the thought that the question of the form of government for united Italy might well be postponed till the Austrians were expelled.

Fourthly, from February to June 1848, the Italian liberals had every reason to expect aid from France, and the internal disturbances in Austria put the Austrians in Lombardy on the defensive side.

For all of these reasons, the liberal revolts in Italy from January to March 1848 were all successful. An insurrection demanding constitutional rule broke out at Palermo in January. The liberal movement spread from the south to the north when the kings of Naples, the Pope, the Duke of Tuscany and even Charles Albert resolved to aid the Venetians, declaring war on Austria and aiming at absorption of the rich Lombardy plains into his kingdom. The Austrian position in Italy seemed the point to collapse. However, the initial success of revolution did not last very long. Just in 1848, they were suppressed by Austria and even unexpectedly, by France.

The Austrian sword proved heavier and sharper. They held the famous quadrilateral, which assured them continual arrival of supplies and freedom of movement. Radetzky was far more an experienced general than Charles Albert. The military factor, however, could not be decisive for the Italian defeat.

In 1848-49 Italy had no foreign aid. There was the saying that ‘Italy cannot get it alone.’. Despite the change of government in February, France disliked the idea of

Piedmont absorbing Lombardy and Venetia, which would give rise into a powerful neighbor to her south. Louis Napoleon, badly in need of clerical support at home, decided to intervene on behalf of the Pope. A French expeditionary force under Oudinot wiped out the Roman Republic. However, nor was this factor decisive.

For the Italian national revolution, the tide had already begun to turn in April 1848. Viewing the Italian unification movement in 1848, Metternich commented that "In Italy, provinces are against provinces, towns against towns, families against families, and men against men." The lack of united leadership permitted the mutual suspicion and local jealousies to destroy the Italian cause. The Pope, in fear of his leadership being challenged in the Catholic world, issued a Papal Declaration denouncing the war versus Austria which is a Catholic country. This only robbed Charles Albert of vital moral support. In May, Ferdinand of Naples following the lead given by the Pope and jealous of Charles Albert's ascendancy, also withdrew his troops from the north.

Politically there was no united front of the Italians. Individualism hence doomed the unification. With the Pope betraying the war, the Mazzinians turned extreme. The murder of Rossi, the flight of the Pope and his ministers from Rome were all examples. Thus on November 1848, it dashed the hope of revolution to be accomplished by the moderates. On the other hand, liberalism of 1848 excluded democracy. The Piedmontese constitutional makers, whose success depended on both the defeat of Austria and the suppression of the Mazzinians and the Venetian republican movements, insisted on keeping Tuscany to prevent republicanism from spreading to the north.

“Italy could not make herself; she could only be made by exploiting the differences between the great powers” How far is this true of the Italian liberation by 1861?

Italian nationalists failed to bring about independence and unity to Italy in 1848-49, chiefly because they had obtained no foreign aid to overwhelm the Austrian military superiority. Not only this. In 1849, foreign intervention was against the Italian cause. The Roman republic set up by Mazzini and Garibaldi was wiped out by French expeditionary force. It was clear that Italy could not make herself. This failure, however, was a bitter lesson to Italians and they understood that Italy could only be united by exploiting the differences between the great powers. As V.D. Mahajan puts, “Unification of Italy was completed as a result of the efforts of the Italian patriots, foreign help and the force of circumstances.” Nonetheless, internal reform to strengthen the role of Piedmont as leadership could not be neglected in the liberation of North Italy by 1861. In this respect, the statement was, to a large extent, true of the Italian liberation by 1861.

The history of Italian unification showed clearly that after 1852 the international circumstances were turned favorable under the cold policy of Cavour. In the very beginning, Cavour realized that Italy could only be made by exploiting the rivalry between France and Austria for supremacy in Italy. In other words, an Austro-French alliance had always meant the doom of Italian hopes. In January 1853, Cavour had flung Sardinia unconditionally into the Crimean War in order to prevent an exclusive Austro-French partnership. In the peace conference, Cavour on the one hand raised the Italian cause, and on the other exploited the difference between Austria and Russia in the Far East. Following the Orsini plot, Cavour even offered Napoleon cession of Savoy and Nice to restore France natural frontiers. The secret pact of Plombieres in July 1858 secured French help to defeat Austria and settle on a North Italian Kingdom for Piedmont and unity of Italy under the leadership of Pope. This Franco-Sardinian Alliance resulted in the annexation of Lombardy to her in 1860.

The Russo-Austro rivalry was inevitable in the Near East, because the Austrian concern with their security at the Lower Danube cut across the Russian move southward to Constantinople. This pair of rivalry was exploited Napoleon III. Not long after Plombieres, Napoleon III sent Prince Jerome on a mission to Russia. Alexander II was obsessed by the Treaty of Paris of 1856 which took away from Russia Bessarabia and imposed upon her the neutralization of the Black Sea, and he was convinced by Jerome that war in Italy was the first essential step towards its revision. On 3rd March 1859 France and Russia finally signed a secret treaty. In the Italian war Russia was to accept a benevolent neutrality towards France. Future revision treaties seemed to be assumed. Indeed, this secret treaty alone made possible the liberation of Italy, for it prevented the movement towards the Italian unification from an intervention by the eastern despotic powers like it was in 1820-21.

Cavour not only made use of the rivalry between France and Austria, as well as Russia and Austria, but exploited the Austro-Prussian rivalry in Germany also. In the Austro-Sardinia War 1859, as Austria made the blunder of delivering the ultimatum to demand the disarmament of Sardinia and thus appeared as the aggressor, Prussian government was alarmed and wanted to keep the war localized. On 24th June, the Prussian government decided to offer armed mediation. In order to escape the risk of a

war on the Rhine, Napoleon III concluded the Truce of Villafrance in 1859. Despite the cession of Lombardy the Italian issue had not yet settled. The Kingdom under the rule of Papal state, following Napoleon III's Catholic dream, had not fulfilled. Napoleon III tried to secure himself from a new Prussian threat, so that he might start a second round in Italy. The prince regent of Prussia, later William I, left behind in the middle of mobilization, hated the contemptuous treatment he had received from Austria. His condition for helping Austria was that Prussia should be put in supreme command of the German federal forces fighting at the Rhine; the Prussian were still dreaming that Austria would surrender leadership in Germany in exchange for military support. But the offer for supremacy in Germany never came from Austria. Moreover, William found Alexander II quite ready to give Napoleon a second round in Italy in the hope of himself achieving something in the Near East. Prussia accepted Russia's guarantee against a French attack on the Rhine, and agreed to drop enmity to France and to be neutral in the affairs of Italy. In this way Prussia was kept out of the war. The Austro-Sardinia War could be ended in a peaceful and fruitful way.

Next to be mentioned should be the Anglo-French rivalry in North Italy. The cession of Nice and Savoy according to the Treaty of Turin alarmed the British. They had the fear for French aggrandizement in the north of Italy, and protested against this change to the settlement of 1815 although in vain. They lost their faith in the French and never recovered it. This led to the British policy of non-intervention which, in effect, facilitated Sardinia-Piedmont absorbing the central and southern Italy.

Even the successful handover of South Italy had taken the test of circumstance. The news of Garibaldi's expedition alarmed Europe with the prospect of a Republican revolution in Italy. The Austrians then worked to revive the Holy Alliance with Prussia and Russia before the unification of Italy was completed. Austria indeed contemplated an armed intervention. This was the great issue of the summer of 1860. Had this intervention succeeded, the Italian unification might have been failed. Russia, however, was pulled back by France. In a memorandum to the Tzar, France did not promise to remain neutral if Austria intervened in Italy in order to protect the King of Two Sicilies or the Pope. On the other hand, France also agreed to settle with Russia in the Near East before approaching other powers. This made Russia think twice and put her interests in the Far East in the top priority.

Then the meeting of the three monarchs at Warsaw in October 1860 turned out to be far from a revival of the Holy Alliance. Austria and Prussia were asked by Russia to remain neutral. They promised that Austria and Russia for the sake of Near East, Prussia for Rhine could not be gained in a near future. As a result, from the Warsaw meeting, Austria did not have a free hand in Italy, and Russia not in a Far East. Britain, for the deep concern of maintaining balance of power in Europe, quickly approved the Italian unification and proclaimed a policy of non-intervention.

In this way, the establishment of kingdom in 1862 owed mostly to French armies since the Pact of Plombieres, and also the moral approval, but these could not have been effective without two other forces, the Russian resentment against the Treaty of Paris, 1856 (After the Crimean War, Napoleon III sent a mission to Russia and later Alexander II was convinced that war in Italy was the first essential step towards revision) and the safety of Near East, and Prussian resentment against the Austrian hegemony in German Confederation.

To a lesser extent, however, Cavour's internal reforms that strengthened the role of Piedmont as a leading state in the unification movement against Austria should not be neglected. For examples, in military aspects, Cavour reorganized the army, built

new fortresses or strengthened old ones, and generally increased the military resources. In economic and communicative aspects, he gave much attention to the development of industry and commerce. The building of factories and the importation of machinery were encouraged. There was also a line of steamboats between Genoa and America. Piedmont came to be hence linked more closely to the West. Furthermore, he negotiated commercial treaties with France, England, Belgium and Holland, Switzerland. In political aspect, Cavour also reinforced the constitution through the building of a board reliable majority. Therefore, by 1859, Piedmont was the most powerful state in Italy.

To conclude, unlike Prussia in the German Unification, Piedmont alone was too weak in standing against the great powers in the unification movement. With a smart Prime Minister and his adoption of cold policy, the international circumstances were exploited to the advantages of Italian causes. That is why to a large extent the statement is correct despite the internal reform should never be neglected.

(supplementary note: Even the ultimate unification of Italy was due much to the Franco-Prussian rivalry for European supremacy in the late 60s. An outcome of the 1866 war was the return of Venetia to Italy and it was after the outbreak of the 1870 war, France withdrew her garrisons from Rome and the unification completed.)

“Italy could not stand it alone.” Critically examine this statement with reference to the Italian unification movement from 1830 to 1870.

Introduction:

Viewing the history of Italian unification, this expression “Italy could not stand it alone” is valid in the sense that it fully reflects the situation at that period of time.

Part I:

The 1830 and 1848 Revolutions proved that Austria was too strong to fight and the lack of foreign aid and skillful diplomacy were the main reasons for the failure.

How and why the 1830 revolution was suppressed;

How and why the initial success of 1848 revolution had to give way to the final suppression;

After the failures, Italians especially Cavour and Emmanuel II realized that Italy “could not stand it alone.”

Part II:

The post-1848 unification movement showed how

- i. the effectiveness of Cavour’s skillful diplomacy; and
- ii. the favorable international circumstances, especially the rivalries among the Great Powers

Conclusion:

It is true that internal reforms also played a significant role in the unification movement after 1848. Nonetheless, they did more to strengthen Piedmont’s role as leadership than to expel Austrian and even the Great Powers. Even with the successful reforms, Italy could not stand against the Great Powers if there was no favorable international circumstances and cold policy. In this sense, the statement does truly reflect the uniqueness of Italian unification in the national and liberal development in the 19th century Europe.

Comparison of the role of Cavour and Napoleon III in Italian unification

When Cavour wanted to enlarge Piedmont kingdom and to build a North Italian Kingdom, Napoleon III wanted to win support from the clergymen and to raise his prestige in home. Despite such differences, both played very important role in the Italian unification. There were many similar points, nonetheless, one difference should not be neglected. In the following I would like to compare and contrast the role of these two great figures in the emergence of a new kingdom in Europe.

Similarities:

1. Both played important role in making Italian unification through foreign assistance, which was generally regarded as the main obstacle in the 1830 and 1848 revolutions
 - i. Cavour:
 - Exploiting the rivalries between Britain and France, Austria and France, Austria and Russia, and Prussia and Austria.
 - ii. Napoleon III
 - Initiative to hold the Plombieres meeting;
 - Getting Russian neutrality through the revision of Black Sea Clause;
2. Both shared similar attitude towards republicanism in Italian unification. By their working against republicans, the republic in Italy had been delayed for a century.
 - i. Cavour:
 - Cavour was a constitutional monarchist who wanted to eliminate Mazzini, leader of the republicans, and Garibaldi's insistence on accomplishing unification by the Italians' own effort and on democracy was contradictory to Cavour's political doctrines and diplomatic skill. He never openly supported the Young Italy and the National Society.
 - ii. Napoleon III
 - In 1863, the French garrison in Rome defended the Papal authority against Garibaldi's offense in favor of the Piedmontese monarchy. By shielding Sardinia-Piedmont, Napoleon III created a powerful bulwark against Republicanism and made possible the unification of Italy under a constitutional monarchy headed by Emmanuel II. On the international level, Napoleon III indeed played the leading role and did the more difficult job than Cavour.
3. Both did not want to have a united Italy, which raised an obstacle to the Italian unification
 - i. Cavour:
 - Realizing the obstacles to Italian unification, Cavour attempted unification of Northern Italy only. According to the Plombieres agreement he was willing to cede Nice and Savoy to France. The agreement proved that he only wanted to unify Northern Italy but not the whole one. Seaman thus pointed out that he was not a true believer of nationalism; Taylor: "Cavour put himself first".
 - In the conquest of southern Italy, he had no intention to help Garibaldi, moreover, he forbade Garibaldi to conquer Rome.
 - ii. Napoleon III:

-The Plombières agreement showed his intention to create a northern Italian kingdom only. Indeed, in order to win the support from the clergymen, he tried to establish a central Italian state under Pope presidency. Even after the Treaty of Villafranca which showed Pope's refusal to accept the offer, Napoleon still placed French garrison in Rome. It prevented Italy from completed unification until 1870 when France was defeated by Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War.

Difference: Cavour: both internal and external; Napoleon III: just external

Cavour reformed Piedmont internally while Napoleon III did nothing although he had been a member of Carbonari.

Cavour aimed to make Piedmont economically progressive, politically liberal and financially stable. In this way he hoped that Piedmont would be strong enough to assume the leadership of Italy in the event of another war with Austria.

Examples of areas in which Cavour's measures were effective were the following

1. Military aspects.

His first reform concerned military affairs. He saw that if Piedmont were to unite Italy, it must prepare for a new war; hence, he reorganize the army, built new fortresses or strengthened old ones, and generally increased the military resources.

2. Economic and Communicative aspects

i. He also gave much attention to the development of industry and commerce. The building of factories and the importation of machinery were encouraged.

ii. The public budget was reorganized, and the taxes, though increased, were more equitably distributed.

iii. He was also able to obtain a large loan from a London bank. He put accounting in order and introduced new fiscal policies.

iv. Communications were improved by the building of railways, roads, harbors, a tunnels through the Alps, and a line of steamboats between Genoa and America. Piedmont came to be linked more closely to the West.

v. Furthermore, he negotiated commercial treaties with France, England, Belgium and Holland, Switzerland. In short, he launched Piedmont on a career of rapid commercial progress. The wisdom of his economic administration was rewarded by the loyalty with which the nation supported all his foreign undertakings.

1. Political aspect

He reinforced the constitution in two ways:

i. to reduce the elements of feudal and clerical privilege;

ii. To build a board reliable majority which would consolidate the parliamentary system and the positions of those who prepared to work through it.

1. Religion

i. In 1850 he drafted the Siccardi Laws which curbed the powers of the Church by abolishing ecclesiastical courts.

ii. In 1855 religious orders were abolished, except those concerned with teaching, preaching and helping the sick.

Therefore, by 1859, Piedmont was the most powerful state in Italy.

Critically examine the role of Cavour in the Italian unification

M. Salvadori highly praised Cavour in the unification of Italy. To him, Cavour was the able pilot guiding a fragile craft into harbor through stormy seas. Cavour had played one force against another: revolutionarism against traditionalism, and secularism against clericalism. Indeed, although A. J. Taylor criticized him putting himself instead of Italy first, his role in the unification was still very crucial. Let us discuss it in the following.

As a liberal, Cavour was a consistent advocate of the principle of laissez-faire, but he was no doctrinaire. His greatest achievement was the modernization of Piedmont. In military aspects, he saw that if Piedmont were to unite Italy, it must prepare for a new war; hence, he reorganize the army, built new fortresses or strengthened old ones, and generally increased the military resources. While in economic and communicative aspects, he also gave much attention to the development of industry and commerce. The building of factories and the importation of machinery were encouraged. The public budget was reorganized, and the taxes, though increased, were more equitably distributed. Moreover, he was able to obtain a large loan from a London bank. He put accounting in order and introduced new fiscal policies. Communications were improved by the building of railways, roads, harbors, a tunnels through the Alps, and a line of steamboats between Genoa and America. Piedmont came to be linked more closely to the West. Furthermore, he negotiated commercial treaties with France, England, Belgium and Holland, Switzerland. In short, he launched Piedmont on a career of rapid commercial progress. The wisdom of his economic administration was rewarded by the loyalty with which the nation supported all his foreign undertakings.

His anti-clericalism made for the dissension in a country in which the majority was Catholics. In constitution, he reduced the elements of feudal and clerical privilege. In 1850 he drafted the Siccardi Laws which curbed the powers of the Church by abolishing ecclesiastical courts. In 1855 religious orders were abolished, except those concerned with teaching, preaching and helping the sick. If in this sense, it was not helpful to Italian unity, it did have the effect of enhancing the role of Sardinian monarchy as the temporal leader of Italy.

Cavour held fast to parliamentarism. He has been criticized as anti-liberal, for he often had recourse to arbitrary means and played politics in parliament only to secure himself in power. However to resist the monarchical pretensions, he strengthened his position in parliament by building up the conservative radical alliance. While his ministry, through its efficiency, became indispensable to the king, Cavour evolved in effect the system of ministerial responsibility to parliament which was the essential feature of the 19th century constitutional liberalism. For many national patriots, the parliamentary system had its attraction, the more so as it provided an answer to the baffling problem that the various peoples of Italy would need different forms of government. Parliamentarism also won for Sardinia-Piedmont British benevolent neutrality in the years of war against Austria.

Yet, Cavour never fell into the error that Italy could achieve independence on her own. He saw clearly that Italy must have the active assistance of a great military power. From the beginning he was keen on playing off France against Austria to the advantage of Piedmont. The Sardinian participation in the Crimean War did not bring Cavour what he desired. What he feared was that a Franco-Austrian alliance which

would upset the balance against Sardinia would emerge. It was the bomb thrown by Orsini that awakened Napoleon III to agree to the necessity that something must be done for Italy. However, Cavour induced Napoleon III to agree to the secret Treaty of Plombieres of 1858 and showed the mastery of diplomatic skill in inducing Austria to declare War on Sardinia. Austria appeared the aggressor and thus compelled Napoleon III to come to the aid of Piedmont. Cavour outwitted Napoleon III in the Central Italian Duchies. He sent agents, Farini, Ricasoli, and pro-Sardinian parties to work out a general uprising there with the new governments of the central duchies demanding an union with Piedmont. Subsequently plebiscites were held in favor of union. Among other reasons, the frustration of Napoleon III's ambition in the Central Duchies directed him to settle with Austria at Villafranca in 1859. By this Treaty of Turin, Cavour gained Lombardy and the Central Duchies for Piedmont though Savoy and Nice was ceded to France.

As a liberal monarchist, Cavour had never forgotten his aim of establishing a constitutional monarchy for the new Italy nor had he lost his shrewdness as a politician in preserving Piedmont the leadership and initiative of the edifice of Italian unification. After the unification of the north, in fear of the republicanism and separatism in the south Italian states, he knew he had to mold events to his advantage. He managed to divert the energies of Garibaldi to Sicily without officially encouraging him. But when Garibaldi had conquered Sicily and was winning victories in Naples, he immediately regain initiative for Piedmont by sending troops into the Papal states. Henceforth Garibaldi would not be gaining all the prestige and glory and his fame would not completely overshadow that of the king. Making use of plebiscites, he managed to annex Naples and Sicily by late 1860. Also he was careful enough not to allow Garibaldi from attacking Rome, thus avoided a direct confrontation.

Despite his great contribution, some limitation should not be overlooked. The first one should be that when he died in 1861, Venetia, Nice, Savoy, Rome and a few other districts had not been unified. The Risorgimento had not been completed. More of that, he also played some negative role in the unification movement.

Also to Salvadori, the Plombieres agreement proved that Cavour only wanted to unify Northern Italy instead of the whole one. Seaman even believed that he was not a true believer of nationalism which was reflected in his willingness to cede Nice and Savoy to France. Even though Napoleon III had not fully fulfilled his obligation assigned by the alliance, Cavour still ceded the two places to France. From this aspects, despite his realization of the impossibility of Italy to make alone, he upset the territorial integrity of Italy.

Cavour's unwillingness to help Garibaldi in conquering the South Italy was again criticized by Taylor as putting himself instead of Italy first. He pushed Garibaldi off to Sicily in order to get him out of the way and in the hope that failure would ruin the radicals once and for all. It was because Cavour was a constitutional monarchist who wanted to eliminate Mazzini, leader of the republicans, and Garibaldi's insistence on accomplishing unification by the Italians' own effort and on democracy being contradictory to his political doctrines and diplomatic skill. Without Garibaldi's 'sword', Italian unification might have not been completed so soon.

In a nutshell, Cavour played important, positive rather than negative role in the Italian unification. The weaknesses of Italy had already placed him into a difficult

position. Only real politics could fulfill the dream, but it was on the expense of accusing from others. Had the unification movement not followed his path, the Italian kingdom would have not been founded only several decades after the suppression of the 1848 revolution.

“Italy was unified by improvisation instead of calculation.” Discuss this statement.

A. Calculation:

1. Whyte ascribes to Cavour great clearness of vision, anticipation of events and even a sureness of touch in all that he did from the time he accepted a ministerial position in the Piedmontese government. Even when he was young, Cavour had high political ambitions and viewed the Italian question as a single question- unification of North Italy by the Piedmontese King under the help of France.
2. Indeed, the calculation could be reflected in the following aspects:
 - i. The participation in the Crimean War, rejecting the wills of the Piedmontese parliament, in order to raise Italian issue to international level, could be regarded as a good example.
 - ii. The Franco-Prussian Alliance which promised to cede Nice and Savoy and the establishment of only a unified North Italy reflected his planning;
 - iii. The Austro-Sardinia War, especially the declaration of war from Austria and hence appeared as aggressor, also followed Cavour’s planning. His compromise with Napoleon III also made possible the annexation of Lombardy;
 - iv. The encouragement of Garibaldi to the South Italy, the prevention of Garibaldi’s attack on Rome.
 - v. Apart from his skillful diplomacy, his internal reform also consolidated Piedmont as a leading state. In this regard, the unification was long planned.

B. Improvisation:

1. Favorable international circumstances such as the rivalries between the powers accidentally happened during that era. This included: ambitions of Napoleon III, Britain and Russia’s non-intervention, struggle for leadership between Austria and Prussia in the German Confederation and so on.
2. Garibaldi’s successful conquest of the South Italy also was unexpected by Cavour.
3. The complete unification was under the hands of Prussia, instead of Italy. Only after the Franco-Prussian War when France was defeated Italy could annex Venetia and even Rome. Obviously, the Franco-Prussian War was not planned by any Italian.

What were the barriers to Italian unity?

Before 1815, Italy had already divided up into many states. In the Vienna Settlement, Venetia and Lombardy were placed under direct Austrian rule. There was no great demand among Italians for unity. Italian unity was really very difficult to obtain and there really had its barriers. In the following I would like to give what these barriers were and how they were overcome.

Since the early Middle Ages, Italy had been from time to time the battleground of the greater powers, and her territory had been split up into many small states which had fought one another, been conquered or annexed, recovered separate existence, been enlarged or diminished in extent, in a bewildering succession of events. The way of life differed greatly between southern and northern Italy. General dissension seemed more characteristic of Italian life than united activity. There was no national flag nor great cooperation between Italian states. Often local rulers had sacrificed national aspirations for self-interest and had sought foreign aid to help win their domestic quarrels. The states were used to be a separate existence and had differing interests, organization and loyalties. There were also different customs, houses for the various states, and there was no uniformity in the currencies, weights and measures and other aspects of organization. In addition, the mountain ranges and the inadequate of roads acted as national barriers to Italian unity.

Moreover, the Congress of Vienna decided to restore the old rulers and the hopes of the more enlightened Italians- that the fall of Napoleon would be followed by the establishment of a single government for the whole country- were dashed to the ground. For the next forty-five years there were eight separate political units in Italy. It was to be expected that every ruler would oppose any scheme of Italian unity which would involve his own retirement. Besides, they abolished all constitutions and many laws and institutions of French origins. No states had a parliament and there was no semblance of popular participation in government. The governments were mostly corrupt, and the peoples were ignorant and superstitious, they had not learned the necessity for concerted action, and many of the early rising were merely local and were easily suppressed.

But, apart from the antagonism of the lesser rulers and the indifference of the people, the greatest difficulties to be overcome by those who schemed for Italian unity were the power of Austria and the power of the Pope. Austria was immensely strong, and she held that she was entitled by reason of her possession of Lombardy and Venetia and of her indirect control of the central duchies, to exercise influence over every state in the peninsula. The Pope presented, perhaps, an even more formidable obstacles to unity, since any attempts to deprive him of control over the states of the church might be met by spiritual penalties, and excommunication presented real terrors to an ignorant peasantry. The Pope had temporal power over central Italy and his territory constituted a break between the northern and southern part of Italy. He was supported not only by loyal Catholics in Italy but also by France and Austria. Any action against the authority of the Pope would certainly arouse Catholic antagonism in these countries.

Furthermore, there were different schools of thought where three main schools of thoughts on how to achieve unity, but all three groups disliked each other and had no wish to cooperate. Mazzini wanted to abolish monarchies and to establish a democratic

republic. Gioberti advocated the idea of formatting a federation headed by the Pope. The intellectuals and business men in Piedmont wanted to have a liberal monarchy under Charles Albert. All these schools of thought affected the unity of Italy.

In addition, the interference from outside also caused the failure of the early attempt to unification. For example, in Naples and Piedmont in 1820, there were revolutionary movements occurred there. In both states, they were for a time successful, and constitutions were granted. However in both states Austrian troops intervened on behalf of the monarchy, the constitutions were annulled, and despotism was re-established. The failure of these efforts was also due to the lack of sound leadership and support from within Mazzini was no statesman, no general, he was the poet, the idealist, the apostle of the movement. Revolutionaries tended to be idealistic because Mazzini was high sounding and idealistic people. The local rising of indefinite aim and with limited support, would be powerless to achieve Italian unity and independence.

There was also a lack of foreign support. In 1830, disturbances occurred in central Italy. The rulers of Parma and Modena were expelled and a considerable rising broke out in the Papal States. The Italians for a time hoped for French support, but Louis Philippe was disinclined to risk his newly won crown in war with Austria, whose prompt action was again successful in pulling down the rebels. As a conclusion the Italian revolts broke out in 1848 were inspired by hatred of foreign rule rather than by the ideal of national unity. The numerous movements of that year had little or no connection with one another, and if they had been successful Italy would still have been divided into many small states and Italian unity would not have been achieved. However, in the subsequent years the mentality of the Italians changed and there had a growing sense of nationalism and together with the other factors, finally contributed to the Italian unity.

(Note: How were these barriers overcome?)

George Meredith's opinion:

There was the growth of national feeling - Carbonari, Young Italy, and the work of Mazzini,

There was also internal reforms and skillful diplomacy of Cavour

There was also the conquest of South Italy by Garibaldi)

Account for Piedmont's leadership in the Italian unification

For centuries Italy, in the phrase of Metternich, was nothing more than a geographical expression. Italy laid under the heel of foreign domination. Unfortunately, the Italian people themselves had not yet attained to a full sense of national consciousness. Italy, like Greece, was a place where almost every spot had its own traditions. So, one attempt after another in 1820, 1830 and 1848 in Italy had failed. It seemed to those who hoped for better things that improvement could not come unless the Papacy would suddenly reform its whole administration; reform could only come from the one really Italian state-Piedmont. Accordingly, men's eyes gradually focused on Piedmont as a possible nucleus of the Italian unification. I would like to explain this in the following.

There were several factors which directly and indirectly led to the emergence of Piedmont to become the leader of the Italian unification.

The kingdom of Sardinian were the only truly independent state in Italy, so it was much easier for her to lead the Italian as she was not under the influence of foreign powers. On the other hand, the other Italian states were directly or indirectly controlled by Austrians, so their revolts were useless. Their success in revolts was only temporary and it was not significant in the whole Italian course. As we can see from the previous uprisings in 1820 and 1830 revolutions, all revolts in those smaller states were met with disaster and were all suppressed by the Austrians. As a result, it was better for Piedmont to lead the Italian unification and helped the other states to expel the Austrian from Italy.

Unlike other Italian states, Piedmont had its favorable strategic position in northern Italy. She was not surrounded by the Austrian influence belt. Her neighboring states such as France or Switzerland had no intention to intervene in the Italian affairs. As a result, this provided her a good advantage which the other states could not possess. So this made her the leader of the Italian unification.

Besides, the failure of the Mazzinian and the Giobertian revolts in 1848 revolutions also strengthened the position of Piedmont in the Italian cause. In 1848, a section of Italian patriots were attracted by the glamour of Gioberti's proposals in his famous *Primato*. He wanted to constitute the Pope to be the head of the Italian league which were composed of different states associated together in a federation. At the same time, Pius IX ascended the papal throne and the new Pope was believed to be anti-Austrian and he was influenced by Gioberti's believers. Later he proclaimed an amnesty for all political offenders and it was followed by other measures such as the institution of a Council of States, the establishment of a municipality in Rome and so on. These spontaneous reforms on the part of the most conservative government in Italy were interpreted throughout the Peninsula as a call to arms. Unfortunately in April, 1848, Pius IX suddenly declared to the world that war with Austrian was wholly abhorrent from the counsels of a Pope. This announcement was significant in some ways than one; primarily it meant that the dream which had inspired Gioberti's *Primato* had collapsed. The plan of a federation was definitely set aside. The immediate result was to encourage the king of Naples to overthrow the constitution of the southern Kingdom and to recall his forces from the front. Hence Gioberti's dream had completely broken into pieces. The defection of her allies left Piedmont to carry on the struggle with Austria single-handed.

In 1849, after the failure of the Giobertians and Charles Albert's attempt to establish the Kingdom of Upper Italy, the revolutionary elements in Rome proclaimed a republic of which Mazzini became the virtual head and the Pope passed into exile. The Pope however appealed to the powers of Europe and found in Napoleon III a source of aid. Since Napoleon III was anxious to placate the clerical opinion at home, the French force eventually overcame the Roman Republic and the Pope was restored. The triumph of despotism was completed- Naples, Sicily, Rome, Venice, Lombardy, had all rebelled but failed. For the causes of Italian unity, the year 1848 seemed to be entirely negative. But gloomy as things were, at least one important lesson had they learnt- the Kingdom of Sardinia must play the leading role in any united Italian movement and foreign aid must be obtained. As a result, we can say that the 1848 revolutions in Italy was the turning point of Italian history as there remained Piedmont whose king, though defeated militarily, gained the leadership after 1848. The event of 1848 also resulted in the emergence to the prime ministership of Sardinia, Cavour who played an important role of making Piedmont the leader of the Italian cause.

Imagine the Mazzinian and the Giobertians succeeded in their revolts, then either a republic or a federation under the Pope's control would have been set up in Italy. Thus the Italian history had to be rewritten and Piedmont would no longer get her leading position in the Italian unification.

Although the Mazzinian movement had failed, Mazzini gave the Italian the idea of a united Italy, he had educated the Italian nation to realize that Italy was a nation and it was not a geographical expression. He had also made the ways of rules for Piedmont to translate his idea from theory into practice, thus making more Italians and public opinions turned to Piedmont. It was no doubt that Mazzini had helped Piedmont to gain support from the Italian and made her the leader of the Italian cause.

Yet if nothing positive was achieved during the revolutionary movements of 1848 in Italy, at least one step forward was gained as the bold, patriotic Piedmont king Viictor Emmanuel II determined on national unity. He was a fiery little man but his devotion to the national cause was never in doubt a great advance over any previous king of Piedmont. Meanwhile, there also came a great statesman- Cavour, whose life-work constitutes the history of the Italian war of liberation on its second phrase.

Cavour came to the head of the government in 1852. His achievement in the domestic event merit some notice. He laid the foundations of an organized and consolidated state- the necessary prelude to an efficient foreign policy. Cavour reformed the finance, developed the railway system, lowered commercial tariffs and the most important one was to improve the military defenses and reorganized the army which made Piedmont has the strongest army and power among the Italian states so as to cope with the strong Austria, this made the Italians to support Piedmont in order to fulfill their aims.

In his foreign policy, Cavour realized that Piedmont was too weak to cope single-handed with the Central Empires. Without any ally, Italian resistance would break into pieces and it was necessary to secure an ally for Piedmont. His first step was taken when assisting the 1853 revolution in Milan, initiated by Mazzini who regarded that Lombardy and Venetia was a strategic center and a successful revolution would paralyze Austria. The intervention failed in its immediate objective but it was approved by England and France and revealed Piedmont as the champion of oppressed Italians. The real turning point, however, came in 1855 with the decision of Cavour to participate in

the Crimean War, a decision which enhanced the prestige of the Sardinian monarchy and gave it a claim upon the gratitude of its allies. In the Congress of Paris in 1856, Cavour denounced the evils of Austrian oppression in Italy and he got sympathy from England's public opinion although she could not lend material assistance to Piedmont.

When Cavour's reform at home, the Italians thought that only Piedmont could lead them to success and under good relationship between Piedmont and other European powers they thought that Piedmont was the real leader of the whole Italy and it is she that could only achieve the Italian cause. As a result, Piedmont's leading status in the Italian cause was raised rapidly.

In addition French intervention in the Italian cause in 1858 also consolidated Piedmont as the leader of liberation. The French king in the meantime was Louis Napoleon who was induced by a variety of motives to assume an active part in the Italian movement.

In 1858 he and Cavour concluded the Pact of Plombieres by which France was to help Italy if she was attacked by Austria. When Austria declared war on Italy in 1859, France duly stepped in to protect Piedmont. After they had captured Lombardy, Napoleon suddenly made an armistice with the Austrians at Villafranca because of strong opposition from home. Cavour's rage was terrible and he resigned office, his work then seemed not compromised. In this crisis, the Italian people however took their destiny into their own hands, recognizing that a nation must learn to lean on itself and the unification could only be accomplished by the Italian themselves.

As a result, central Italy boldly refused to accept the decision that the rulers of Parma, Tuscany, Modena and the Romagna had been restored. The Austrian debacle should be rested and they determined to unite with Piedmont. Napoleon was true to the principle of the plebiscite by which he himself had risen to power, agreed to allow them to do so if the populace wished. The populace did wish and an overwhelming vote declared in favor of union with the Sardinian monarchy. Thus the result of Napoleon's intervention in 1859 was the addition not only of Lombardy but of central Italy to Piedmont. It seemed that to unify with Piedmont was the only practice in achieving Italian unity now fast becoming a fact. Her leading position in Italian cause was consolidated.

Suggested that France continued the war with Austria or got Venetia, then the whole Italian movement might have been achieved and the Frenchmen and Piedmont would only play a minor role in the whole national movement.

Lastly, the activities of the remarkable man, Garibaldi, also played an important part of bringing Piedmont the leader of the Italian cause. As the head of his Thousand Red Shirt, he landed at Marsala and within a month, the red shirts had forced the retirement of the Neapolitan garrison. Garibaldi then crossed the Strait of Messina and took up their headquarters at Naples which the Bourbon King had already evacuated.

Although Garibaldi had conquered Naples and Sicily, which threatened the leading position of Piedmont, as now it came the critical moment- could he remain faithful to Emmanuel II or if he then swept into the Papal States, would he declare some sort of republic? Fortunately it was Cavour who had returned to power and saved Piedmont from being thrown out of the Italian cause. He realized that the republican supporters of Mazzini were now gaining great strength among Garibaldi's followers, it was very dangerous that the nationalist movement might abandon Piedmontese leadership and turned republican. He must therefore somehow check Garibaldi's plans and making the Italians turned to the Piedmontese. By agreement with France, he sent the

Piedmontese army to invade the Marches and destroyed the Papal forces. Further the army marched onto Naples, forestalling and checking the movement of Garibaldi. After a popular plebiscite had been held in Umbria, Marches and Naples and they were duly annexed to the Piedmontese monarchy one after one. The victory was a personal triumph for Cavour as the leading position of Piedmont was further strengthened and their success was not far. The union of Italy under the leadership of Piedmont was now an accomplished fact.

All in all, we have seen that there are several factors which directly and indirectly made Piedmont as the leader of the Italian cause. For instance, the coming of a liberal king and also an efficient prime minister, Cavour who made the prosperity of Piedmontese economy, good relationship with the Italians and the European power. Also the failure of Mazzinian, Giobertian and Garibaldian in achieving their own ambitions also helped the emergence of Piedmont. Besides the France intervention in 1859 also consolidated the leading position of Piedmont and gained more support from the Italians as they now realized that Piedmont was their savior which only she could emancipate them from Austrian domination. Finally in 1870, Italy was united and free, the Italian unification under the leadership of Piedmont was achieved.